

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXX. No. 24.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 15, 1816. [Price 1s. 4d.

737].

[738

## TO CORRESPONDENTS

*On the subject of Emigration to America.  
—Arrival of Literary Ambassadors at  
New York.*

I can easily excuse, at a moment like the present, the applications that are made to me for information upon this subject. More than 2,000 passports, the papers tell us, have been granted within *one month*, to persons emigrating to the Continent of Europe; and, we learn, through the same channels, "that many men, who have obtained *certificates* from the Justices of the Peace to go to America, have left their wives and children for the parish to keep." This America cannot be the *real* America; the flourishing, the happy America, where a strong, able, sober labourer may, if he choose, live well and save 30 pounds sterling a year. Because, to go to *this* America, a man needs no *certificate* from any body, as the law now stands. I am not aware, that I can, at present, give any information in particular relative to emigration. I will never *advise* any person to emigrate; but, I will, from time to time, give the best information I possess as to the state of America; and I promise myself that this information will soon become very regular and perfectly accurate; for, I have the very great pleasure of informing my readers, that *my Ambassadors* arrived at the beautiful City of New York on the 10th of May, after a very tempestuous voyage. On the 11th they write to me a hasty letter, in which, however, they state, that New York surpasses their most sanguine expectations, though those expectations had been raised very high. They say, that *ten thousand* persons have arrived at that one city, from Europe, since the peace; and that the last year's importation of merchandize in that port alone has amounted to *fifty-*

*three millions of Dollars.* But, these parts of their letter are far less interesting to me than another part, which informs me of a recent triumph of the principles of *real* freedom over all their foolish and wicked opponents. An Albany paper, which the Ambassadors have enclosed, in their dispatch, No. 1, shews me, that, for the House of Assembly of the great and opulent State of New York, 88 members out of 126, have been just chosen by the sworn enemies of what has been impudently called "*legitimacy*." But, a paragraph from a New York paper, which is a Cossack, apparently, and devoted to the English *Factory* there, has pleased me more than any thing else. This paper is called "the New York Evening Post;" the date is 10th May; and the paragraph is in the following words:—"We perceive, by the ship-news of the day, that the agent which Cobbett so condescendingly promised to send to New York early in the present spring, has *actually arrived this forenoon*. But he has reached his destination the day after the fair; owing to the very long passage the ship has had; no less than 75 days. Had he come a fortnight sooner, and commenced his operations, he might have *laid claim to the honour of the victory which democracy has lately achieved*."—Thus I have the best possible proof, that the cause of freedom triumphs in that country. Yes, the recent events in Europe have opened the eyes of those persons in America, who were not *quite blind*; and these events will not be tardy in driving from public hearing any man, in that country, who shall still remain base enough to attempt to support the principles of despotism. "*The day after the fair!*" Oh, no, Sir! My Ambassadors were not dispatched, I can assure you, on any *transient* errand. They are not sent for any *special* purpose. They are not ministers *extraordinary*, whose business it is to qualify for a good thumping pension for the rest of their lives. They are to be



*resident Ambassadors* at the great court of freedom in America, and are to be the regular channel of communication between that court and the free minds at Botley. Oh, no, Sir! Mine are none of those sneaking missionaries, those palavering professors of friendship, those spies under the garb of affection, those satanic interlopers, who, while they smile on and wheedle you, are plotting, in their malignant hearts, how they shall transform your Paradise into a place resembling the Hells that they have left behind them. Oh, no, Sir! My Ambassadors were not sent for the purpose of aiding in the decision of *one* election. Such an object, if I were vain enough to suppose myself capable of effecting it, would be of too temporary a nature. My object is to *keep up a literary intercourse* with your country. By the means of that intercourse I mean to make known to you and to the people of England, truths the most important, and truths, which, without an intercourse of this *very* description, can never be made known. The origin of this mission I have explained. The motives have been as truly stated to the public as to my own pillow. I have disguised no step that I have taken, and no single step will I disguise, or attempt to disguise.

It appears to me, and long has appeared to me, that the cause of freedom could in no possible way be so effectually assisted, and that of despotism so effectually assailed, as by making the people of America and of England well acquainted with all that passes and has passed in the two countries respectively, and by spreading, throughout the world, by means of the American press, facts which otherwise must remain long, and, perhaps, for ever, unknown.—I have before described the manner, in which the two nations, the *two peoples*, have been kept in a state of ignorance with regard to each other. The newspapers, and other Periodical Publications, going from England, have been, and must continue to be, the grossest deceivers upon earth. Nine-tenths of them are devoted to corruption; the other tenth are held in awe. *No truth*, no useful political truth, can possibly go through such a channel.—From America excellent matter *might* always have been received; but, the channel was not open. The persons corresponding with each other in the two

countries were such as were by no means likely to feel any interest, much less any *zeal*, in the promulgation of useful political truths. Hence no periodical publications reached us (except by mere accident) but such as represented the American people in the odious light of friends of despotism on the one side, and as bloody-minded savages on the other.—I have before shewn how all my endeavours to obtain a regular supply of true information have been defeated, and, even during the last week of May, two parcels, kindly sent me by Mr. Mitchell of the National Advocate of New York, have been lost to me, in consequence of their having been sent to the Post-Office by the Captain of the ship Triton, from which office they came to me, charged with postage to the amount of *thirteen pounds sterling!*—Now, I ask, not any lover of truth; not any friend of fair-play; but, I ask any hypocritical Cossack, of either country, whether it be not laudable to endeavour to surmount such obstacles to free-discussion; such unnatural, such odious bars between the minds of men? I have not only *endeavoured* to surmount them; I *have surmounted* them. And, if the hopes and expectations of a mind naturally sanguine do not deceive me upon a point where a parent is most likely to be too sanguine, the success of the enterprize is placed even beyond the powers of disease and of death itself. Experience has taught me not to be so stupidly conceited as to suppose, that I, or my sons, are able to be *directly* the worker, or workers, of the great good that I contemplate. But, as those humble creatures, the Silk-worm and the sheep, supply the means of cloathing and decorating so large a part of man and woman kind; so may our materials, by passing through abler hands, largely contribute towards the dissemination of useful political knowledge; towards the storing of the minds of the rising generation with interesting facts and sound deductions; towards keeping alive the flame of real liberty at a time when the most enormous and atrocious efforts are making to extinguish every spark of the sacred fire in every human breast.

WM. COBBETT.

TO THE  
PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA.

LETTER XVI.

*A reduction of the interest of the National Debt talked of in the House of Commons.*

Botley, 7th June, 1816.

The great subject, the touching of the interest of the National Debt, has, at last, been clearly stated in the Parliament. I observed, several months ago, that the matter would begin to be talked of this session; and, that, in all human probability, the next session would see something done. It is a subject of infinite importance, not only to us, but to the whole world; for, into what part, what nook or corner, of the world, does not this government thrust its hand? And, therefore, as you may be well assured, the fate of this government, or, rather, this present System of sway, depends entirely upon the fate of the funds; that is to say, upon the capacity of the government to get from the nation at large the means of paying the interest of the Debt which the government has contracted; as you may be well assured that this is the case, you will want nothing more to convince you, that the subject now before us is the most interesting that can be imagined to the liberties and happiness of mankind. All the kings and emperors of Europe; the Bourbons and their Royalists; the Pope; the Dominicans; the Jesuits; the Holy Office; the Cossack Priesthood of America. All have a deep interest in this question. In short \* \* \* ; and, therefore, I shall not scruple to go into it in the fullest manner that my limits and time will allow.

In the House of Commons, on the 31st of May, a Mr. JOHN PETER GRANT, who is a Scotch Lawyer, I believe (for I have never heard of him till this winter), because I see, that he is a Member of the Kelt Society, and because they call him, "the learned Gentleman," brought forward a series of Resolutions on the state of the Finances. It has been a custom, for many years, for some man, who belongs to what is called "the Opposition," the nature and end of which I have so clearly

described to you, to bring forward a set of formal propositions, describing the state of the finances; and, of course, with a view to produce an impression unfavourable to the Ministry and their management. As a counterpart to such propositions, the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the time being has always produced a set of propositions of an opposite tendency, which, he always having a majority of votes, have been passed by the House after the rejection of those of the Opposition man. This Office of Annual Resolution Proposer was filled for many years, by Mr. Sheridan; it then fell to Mr. Tierney; next it was taken up by a Mr. George Johnson, whom I have not heard of for some years. He went out of public life like the snuff of a Rush-light. I should, really, be glad to know what became of him. He worked so hard at this Resolution grinding, that in hot weather, he used actually, as I was informed, to strip to his shirt while engaged in it. Whether such intense application of the mind proved injurious to his intellectual or corporeal faculties, and thereby operated at once as a check to the pursuit in him and a discouragement to it in others, I know not; but, since his time, no one has undertaken the sublime task until a sufficiency of talent, courage, and patriotism were found in the person of Mr. J. P. Grant above-mentioned.

As I am not aware, that it would be possible for you to gather one single jot of useful information from a perusal of the Speech and the resolutions of Mr. Grant; as I am quite convinced, that every attentive reader of the Register must understand the real state of our financial resources and operations a great deal better than from that speech and those Resolutions, Mr. J. P. Grant appears to me to understand them, I will not impose on you the fruitless task of reading either one or the other.

But, that which was said, upon this occasion by Mr. SMITH, one of the Members for the City of Norwich, is of great importance, especially when we view it in conjunction with what was said in reply by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and with what it has called forth from the hired prints of this country. I will first give you the report of the words of Mr. Smith, which is as follows:

"Mr. W. SMITH rose to second the



"motion, and said that though great accuracy of detail had been brought forward by the Honourable Mover, yet this was not necessary on his view of the question. He did not attach any blame to his Majesty's Ministers: the difficulties in which they had been placed were an excuse for many errors; but he recollected that he had seconded the repeal of the Income Tax, not because he thought the money was not wanted, but because the measure itself was so unconstitutional that he thought it incumbent on Parliament to redeem the pledge that had been given by the Minister, and repeal the Tax. It might be said, that his Honourable Friend had erred in some trifling particulars; but with that he had nothing to do—those sums were so small that they made no impression on the total deficit. Making all allowances for any errors or overstatements in the Resolutions of his Honourable and Learned Friend, the gloomy conclusion could not be got rid of, that in the next year there would be a great deficiency in the Finances. Whether the deficiency was 10 or 20 millions, it was still appalling, and he was convinced that it could *only be provided for by the remedy which he had formerly hinted at*. He wished his persuasion of that necessity might have proceeded from ignorance or despair, but he confessed that he did not contemplate the remedy he had alluded to, with *that dismay* with which others beheld it. If difficulties were looked in the face, it could not be disguised that, *sooner or later some reduction must be made in the dividends*; and though some Gentlemen had looked to such a measure with the most fearful and gloomy apprehensions of the consequences, he did not think that the effect would be so dangerous as was imagined."

Now, it is no more than justice to myself to state, that I, several months ago, said, in the Register, that this matter would be *begun to be talked of* during this very session of parliament; that, from the moment the *peace* was first talked of, I warned the country against hoping to see the taxes reduced, unless loans were made in time of peace, or, unless a reduction were made in the Dividends on the Debt, or unless the System of Rule were

totally changed. To keep up this System I knew that a large peace establishment would be necessary. Every day of the Session has brought some new proof of the correctness of these opinions. Many *hints* have been thrown out about a reduction of the Dividends; but, at last, the hints have been changed into plain expressions. We will now see (for this is very important) what the Chancellor of the Exchequer said in answer to this remark of Mr. Smith. We shall find him reprobating the proposition; but, we shall not find him showing, that the thing proposed can be avoided without re-imposing the odious task on Income.

"The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER admitted that the Hon. and Learned Gentleman (Mr. Grant) had done himself credit by the clearness of his statement, and the abilities he had displayed; but it was impossible that he could concur in his Resolutions, which *added but one to the strings of gloomy prognostications* which had regularly been submitted to Parliament at the close of the Session, and which had *never been acceded to by the House*. The country, *from year to year, had surmounted its difficulties*, in spite of these predictions, and had finally triumphed in its great contest, and he trusted that experience would shew that the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's Resolutions were at least as groundless as those of any of his predecessors. The present *difficulties of the country were great*, but compared with those of former years *not very alarming*. We had long *contended for existence*—now the only question was *whether we could dispense with burthens which the country had before borne and from which it had been relieved*. He trusted that the country would not need to *recur to those burthens*, but, at any rate, the country would not be *reduced to the extraordinary remedy hinted at by the Honourable Seconder* (Mr. Smith.) This remedy, which the Honourable Member had mentioned less distinctly than became the proposer of such a measure, *was nothing less than a national bankruptcy*. The Honourable Member had on a former occasion spoken of the same proposal more distinctly, *under the name of a reduction of the interest of the National Debt*. It could not be necessary to say, that to a pro-



"position so devoid of justice and wisdom  
 "the House would never accede. The  
 "country would lose more in credit and  
 "resources of every kind, than it could  
 "in any manner gain by such an enormous  
 "breach of faith. (Hear, hear hear!)"  
 "Whatever burthens were imposed on the  
 "stockholders, in common with other  
 "classes of the King's subjects, they  
 "would cheerfully bear, as they had  
 "cheerfully borne the tax on their pro-  
 "perty when plausible reasons might have  
 "been urged against it. On this extra-  
 "ordinary proposal it was unnecessary to  
 "say more."

As to the "gloomy predictions" having  
 hitherto proved "groundless," if the fact  
 were such, that would be no reason to  
 believe, that such predictions will now  
 prove groundless. The affairs of a nation,  
 as they are a long while in moving, so are  
 they slow in falling into utter confusion.  
 "It is the last feather," as PAINE says,  
 "which breaks the horse's back." Besides,  
 what is ruin? If, twenty-five years ago,  
 we had been told that the nation would  
 be ruined, we might have asked the pro-  
 phet: "what do you call ruin?" And,  
 if he had said: "why, the whole of the  
 "real property of the country will be  
 "taxed to the full amount of the rent;  
 "the farmer will pay to the government  
 "more than he will pay to the landlord;  
 "the poor-rates will amount to eight mil-  
 "lions of pounds sterling a year; every  
 "fifth man will become a pauper or a  
 "beggar; it will be necessary to keep up  
 "in time of peace a regular army of 150  
 "thousand men; soldiers will be openly  
 "avowed to be employed, in a conside-  
 "rable part of the kingdom, to collect  
 "the taxes and make the people pay their  
 "tythes; misery will, at last, prevail to  
 "such a degree, that the occupiers of the  
 "land will decamp, leaving whole pa-  
 "rishes in a wild state, and the poor to  
 "seek food how they can; the rich will  
 "flee to the Continent of Europe in or-  
 "der to avoid paying such heavy taxes; it  
 "will be proposed in parliament to pass a  
 "law to compel them to remain at home;  
 "thousands upon thousands of the hardy  
 "and enterprising will go to America to  
 "better their lot; the jails will be filled  
 "with Debtors, lately persons of great  
 "respectability and of competence."

If this had been the answer of a pro-  
 phesying politician twenty-five years ago,

should we not have said: "aye! this  
 would, indeed, be ruin; but this never  
 will take place?" Would not this have  
 been our reply? Well, then, is not ruin  
 actually arrived? The Chancellor of the  
 Exchequer, in order to obtain any degree  
 of weight to his argument, should have  
 shown, that the country was ever before  
 in such a state. On the contrary, he ac-  
 knowledges, and well he may, that the  
 difficulties of the country are great,  
 though, he says, "not very alarming."  
 And, then he rides off upon the observa-  
 tion, that we "have been contending for  
 our existence." This I deny. I deny that  
 the war was either necessary or just. I  
 say, that we have been contending for the  
 restoration of the Bourbons and not for  
 any interest of England. We will, there-  
 fore, throw this interloping observation  
 aside, and stick to the matter in dispute.

The Chancellor plainly enough indi-  
 cates his opinion, that the thing cannot go  
 on without the Income Tax. "The only  
 question," he says, "is, whether we can  
 dispense" with that Tax or not. And, in  
 spite of his "trusting" that we can, Mr.  
 PONSONBY very justly concluded, that the  
 intention was to re-impose that terrible  
 impost; in answer to which conclusion no  
 observation was made. It is clear as day-  
 light, that it will be impossible to pay the  
 interest of the Debt and to keep up even  
 one half of the piece establishment with-  
 out the *Income Tax*, or, without *large*  
*loans*. The latter would, in a few years,  
 blow up the whole system; the former  
 would hasten greatly the exchange of real  
 property from hand to hand. The present  
 owners of estates must lose them; and  
 that, too, in a very few years; and, be-  
 fore this can take place, a serious strug-  
 gle of some sort must and will take place.

The Chancellor, poor man, appears to  
 have been, quite shocked at the proposition  
 of Mr. Smith. He spoke of a reduction of  
 the dividends, as being "nothing less than  
 "a *National Bankruptcy*; as something  
 "so devoid of justice that the House  
 "would never accede to it, as an enor-  
 "mous breach of faith." And, indeed,  
 Mr. J. P. Grant appears to have concurred  
 in these views of the proposition. But,  
 then, we may very reasonably ask Mr. J.  
 P. Grant, why he did not point out some  
 other remedy for that defalcation, which  
 he said would certainly take place. As  
 to the breach of faith, we will observe on

it presently, when we have heard what the *Courier* of the next day said on the subject. And here, you will please to observe, that you are not to look upon the article, I am about to quote, as the production of the proprietor, or editor, of the *Courier*: but as the production of \* \* \* \* \*; and, therefore, worthy of great attention. Observe how they *menace* the Land-owners. The *conflict of interests*, which I have before described to you so fully, is here actually beginning to *break out*.

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed his strong, unqualified, and final dissent from the opinions advanced by Mr. W. Smith, which were understood to be in favour of *diminishing the interest* on the National Debt. Mr. W. Smith has suggested this remedy for our embarrassments on former occasions. There is not much of ingenuity or originality in the suggestion, though there is much of *boldness and of mischief*. Reduce the interest! Why not reduce the principal also? Of what value would be the principal without the interest? There is no engagement to repay the principal; the only engagement is to pay the interest. The property, therefore, consists in the interest, and *not in the principal*. And why, exclusively, rob those individuals of their property, who have been the *most forward to assist* the country in the hour of distress; who have, with the most ready confidence, placed their faith in Parliament? By what tenure do they hold their property? By the *law of the land*, solemnly enacted by the three branches of the Legislature. By what tenure do the *Landholders hold their property*? By law also: not indeed by statute law, but by common law, by usage. *How came the Duke of Bedford, for instance, by his great landed estates?* His ancestor having travelled on the Continent—a lively, pleasant man, became the companion of a foreign Prince, wrecked on the Dorsetshire coast where Mr. RUSSELL lived. The Prince recommended him to HENRY VIII. who, liking his company, gave him a large share of the plundered Church Lands. Why should such a property be more respected than that which has been acquired by the merchant, the manufacturer, the soldier, the sailor, the arti-

san; and which, on the faith of Parliament, has been advanced to Government? Should the gifts of a capricious tyrant be *more respected* than property which has been *hardly earned* and placed under the protection of the *three branches of the Legislature*? In principle we may perhaps agree with Mr. SMITH. Let the *funded and landed and other property* equally contribute to the reduction of the national debt. Let *a part of the land go to this purpose as well as a part of the funds*. The Property Tax fell on all alike, and so should the burthen of attaining the object Mr. SMITH has in view, *which is undoubtedly a most desirable one*. The Landholders, who constitute nine tenths of the Parliament, have decreed that the landed estates of Bankers are liable to their debts. The Parliament is the debtor of the *Fundholder*, and will it renounce its own principle of justice for its *own particular advantage*? Will it *borrow money to ease its own property and then refuse to pay*? This would be *swindling*. A County Member lately complained in Parliament, that commodities being now cheap, a Stockholder could buy double the quantity he lately could do, while Landholders' incomes were diminishing. But what is the truth? The war reduced the *power of purchase* by the Stockholder to one half, while that of the Landholder was more than doubled; and now that prices are beginning to return *a little* towards their former state, the Landholder cries out because the monstrous inequality does not continue in his favour! *He has been wallowing in wealth while the income of the Stockholder has every year been deprived of more and more of its efficiency*; and now he complains that this *injustice does not continue*! But we are not inclined to believe the resources of the country unequal to its necessities. At the end of the American war the same disproportion existed. Our difficulties are undoubtedly great, and must be met with rigid economy; but our dangers are at present *only speculative*. We must experience a few years of peace to *ascertain our real situation*. Our resources grew with the war; they expanded, adapted themselves with elasticity to every occasion. How gloomy were the



"predictions when the great commercial failures took place in 1793, and how have they been belied? Is not peace more friendly to national wealth than war? The change from the one state to the other may shock and alarm, but experience in the past should inspire confidence in the future. Of this we are certain, that *a Bankruptcy, such as Mr. Smith hints at, would produce a revolution.* Those most attached to *Church and State*, as now existing, would be ruined; depreciation of commodities, want of employment, riots, insurrections, confusion, would ensue. The only doubt would be, whether the troubles would end in the *establishment of a Military Government; or of a Republic, ruled by Dissenters.* — The friends of the present system would disappear."

*John Bull* will look upon this article as the offspring of the brain of that meritorious person, Mr. Stuart, who from being a journeyman taylor, has mounted from the shop-board to a chariot by the means of the *Courier*, and which Mr. Stuart never did, I have heard, write a paragraph in his life. But you know whence the article really comes; and, in that knowledge, you possess, with regard to this very important subject, a great advantage. It is a subject, upon which the Opposition papers are *wholly silent.* To the factions it is like a hot poker. They dare not touch it yet. It must be first exposed a little to the air to get cool. Mr. Smith is of no faction. He wants neither place nor pension. He has, therefore, spoken out.

Let us, now, examine this article, and see what it is made of. It is very true, that the suggestion is *not novel*, if we include what has been said out of Parliament; for, I suggested the necessity of such a measure *more than ten years ago*; and, if it had been adopted at that time, with the qualifications that I proposed, the present difficulties and scenes of distress would never have existed. It is true, on the other hand, that, in all human probability, the Bourbons would not have been restored; the Pope would still have been a wanderer; the Dominicans and Jesuits might have still been waiters at inns; the Protestants of France might have still lived in safety; the Public Buildings at Washington might have not furnished a

subject for "the most brilliant dash of the whole war," as the *Morning Chronicle* called it; and we might have had no Waterloo Monument. But, I am quite sure, that the real peace and happiness of the country might, at that time, have been restored, without any serious and lasting injury to any description of persons. So far, however, was I from being heard with attention, that the newspapers of both parties fell upon me as if I were a monster in human shape. I was accused of being a swindler, a robber, a murderer; as if the Debt had been *due from me only!* Mr. SHERIDAN (wise patriot!) accused me *in parliament*; and gave hints to the Attorney-General, which were by no means unintelligible, that it would be proper to lay his hands upon a man who was endeavouring to *ruin the credit of the country!* Whether Mr. Sheridan be yet alive I have no means of knowing; but, if he be, and in a state to observe what is passing at this time, I hope he will have the justice to feel a little shame for his conduct of that day.

Though not *novel*, the writer says, that Mr. Smith's proposal is "*bold and mischievous.*" This is precisely the old cant. Bold! what, then, does it require any very great degree of boldness to propose a measure in parliament? To entitle the act to the merit of boldness, there must exist some *danger*; and, is it pretended, that Mr. Smith exposed himself to danger upon this occasion? I can remember, indeed, when Mr. ROBSON's words were *taken down*, upon his saying that the Bank notes were little better than assignats, the Speaker declaring, that any Honourable Member was *disorderly*, who should say any thing to the prejudice of the credit of the country. Poor Mr. ROBSON ate his words with all imaginable dispatch; and seemed to think himself very well off so to get out of the affair. But, that time is past. Mr. Smith may now not only suggest, but may propose, this measure without any degree of danger.

As to the *mischievousness* of the proposition, or, rather, suggestion, what was ever suggested, which tended to expose the System, and which was not called *mischievous*? Either Mr. Smith has reason on his side, or he has not. If he has not, it is easy to expose the fallacy of

his suggestion ; if he has, his suggestion ought to be attended to, and is likely to do good. But, this is the sort of charge under which a bad cause always endeavours to shelter itself. No one is impudent enough to deny the benefit that must, as to all public matters, arise from *free discussion*. No one, not even the most interested priest, will deny this, as to matters of religion. But, when the pinch comes ; when either the minister or the priest sees his system, or his measures, in danger from this free discussion ; he then resorts to the charge of *mischievousness*, which he boldly brings against his opponent, whom he loads with all kinds of abuse and the imputation of every bad motive ; and then, wrapping himself up in dignified silence, calls upon the Attorney General *to do his office* ; and, when once this gentleman sets to work, he soon teaches your man of free discussion what is the real meaning of those words. This was literally the conduct of BURKE towards PAINE. The latter, having no support of any sort but that of his talents, sent forth *fifty thousand* copies of an answer to a book of the former, which, even with a government to push it about, had not reached, and never did reach a *sale of ten thousand*. Finding himself defeated and exposed, and unable to reply, BURKE actually, in his place in parliament, called on the Attorney General to make the reply ! The call was speedily answered ; the prosecution was carried on with success ; Paine had his choice between Newgate and flight ; his work was suppressed ; fifty men, perhaps, first and last, were punished for promulgating the work ; but, after all, Paine's work is sought after with avidity, at almost any price, while that of Burke may be got from any bulk or stall in London at a price little higher than that of waste-paper. So much for *free discussion* in England ! So much for the term "*mischievousness*."

Happily for Mr. SMITH, he stands in no fear of an answer in the form of an ex-officio information. He has a place to speak from which protects him from all the danger, contained in the hints of the Courier. He dares speak out, he has spoken out, and others will, at no distant day, follow his example.

The cavil, which this writer makes about the *principal* amounts to nothing.

To be sure Mr. Smith means, that a part of the *property* of the fund-holder must be taken away ; that is to say, that the nation cannot pay the whole amount of the Debt. He has not *said*, however, nor has any body else, that I know of, that the land-owners are not to lose *part of their property also*. The question with me is not, whether the land-owners are to lose part of their property as well as the fund-holders ; but whether taxes sufficient to pay the fund-holders can be raised. This writer says, that the *law* is the guardian of property, and especially of funded property. Why the law is, or was, the guardian of many things. The *law* guaranteed the right of the people to elect even their Sheriffs ; the *law* guaranteed to the people the right of taxing themselves ; the *law* even now forbids any place of profit or trust, civil or military, or any pension to be bestowed upon any person, not a *natural born* subject of the king of this kingdom. Yet, how stands the *practise*, compared with the law in these cases ? The *law* says, that no foreigner, *though naturalized by act of parliament* (as the Prince of Saxe-Cobourg has been), shall hold any place of profit or trust, civil or military. The *law* says that the people shall have the benefit of the *Act of Habeas Corpus* ; and, if this law can be suspended, for seven years together, by another law, why may not the law about the funds ? The *law* forbade Pitt to lend the public money to Boyd and Benfield to enable them to make good an instalment on a loan ; but, when Pitt was discovered to have done this, another law was passed to screen him from punishment. And, if this can be done ; if law can be rendered flexible in such matters as these, why not in the case before us. To come closer to the point ; the *law* compelled the Bank Company to pay their bills in gold and silver on demand. They *refused* to do this ; and a law was passed to screen them from punishment for the refusal. The *law* compelled tenants to pay their landlords in gold or silver ; but another law, *after the contract*, was made to authorize them to pay in Bank Notes. The *law* compelled tenants to pay the whole of their stipulated rents to their landlords ; but another law was passed to compel the tenants to withhold a part of the rent and to pay it over to the govern-



ment's taxing people. The *law* made certain lands unalienable; but another law authorized the temporary possessors to sell them, under the name of *redeeming the land tax*; and thus were entailed estates taken, in part, absolutely and for ever from the heirs.

So that, to talk about the *law* is, perhaps, the very foolishest thing which this writer could have done. The common law, he says, guarantees to men the possession of their lands; but, it did not guarantee the heirs of those, who sold part of their entailed estates under the Land Tax Redemption Bill. The law guaranteed the due execution of the will of Lady Mildmay's father respecting an estate in Essex; but, Pitt and the Parliament found another law to set that will, in part at least, aside. Why, if such things as these can be done, what a cavil is it to set up the *law* in opposition to the proposal of Mr. Smith?

But, this writer says, that, if the fund-holders lose a part, so ought the land-owners; and that an estate in the funds is held by as good a *tenure* as the Duke of Bedford's estate. I very much like to hear this sort of language; because it tends to bring the parties, at once, to issue. And, I like it, too, on another account: it shews what *sort of a conflict* we shall, at last, come to. "Let part of the land go to this purpose as well as part of the funds." That is to say, let part of the estates be sold and given to the fund-holders. To this I have no sort of objection, upon the principle of the Courier, namely, that "the Parliament is the Debtor of the Fund-holder." They have borrowed the money; and they ought to pay it back. The case of the Bankers, as cited here is complete. Their lands are made liable for their debts. And why not the lands of the Members of Both Houses of Parliament? This writer asks, "will the Parliament renounce its own principle for its own peculiar advantage? Will it borrow money to ease its own property, and then refuse to pay? This would be swindling."

Answer him, Giles Jolterhead, Esq.! Answer him, I say; for *I will not*. But, to you, in America, I must address a few remarks upon this very interesting part of the subject. The plain unvarnished

case, stated by an unshackled pen, is, then as follows: \*\*\*\*\*

But the impudence of this writer in menacing the country with a "*military government*" in case of a non payment of the interest, is quite astounding. Pray, Mr. hireling, what is a "*military government*." But, I will not beggar my indignation by half or a quarter expression of it. I will express it, where I *dare* express it in my own language, and agreeably to my real sentiments. I agree with this hireling, however, that the non-payment of the interest of the Debt would make strange havoc amongst the friends of the system. Those who have contracted the Debt are very much puzzled. They would fain, perhaps, throw the burthen from them. They hear the menacing language of the Fund-holders; and, really, though I choose not to detail what I think will take place, I am convinced, that the *innocent* people, who have deposited their money in the funds, will not, at last, be suffered to be robbed of their property. A very considerable part of the fund-holders have sold their estates and lent the money to "*the Parliament*," as the Courier calls it. They have been, by the weight of taxes, compelled first to mortgage, and then to sell, their estates; and, instead of land-owners, to become mere *state annuitants*. Surely their property ought to be regarded as sacred as that of those who have kept their lands and who have borrowed the money for which their neighbours sold their estates? However, this is a matter, in which the friends of Reform have no concern; no, not the least in the world. The *borrowers* and the *lenders* must settle the question between them, just as the *Clergy* and the *Yeomanry Cavalry* must the question about *Tithes*. I am for taking no very active part with either. The best way will be to stand aside, look on, and amuse one's self with the wrangling of parties, all of whom have so long united against us.

In the meanwhile the *effects* of this dreadful Debt are felt most severely. The number of paupers is hourly increasing. The *emigrations* to the Continent and to America are such as they never before were from England. The news-papers tell us of many, who leave their wives and children a burthen upon the parish. A paragraph has appeared, in all the Lon-

don papers, stating this fact; but, as I have before observed, it cannot be true, that "certificate" have been obtained for the purpose of enabling the parties to go to the United States. To Canada, perhaps. But people do not want to go to that country; and, as to Nova Scotia, there is no bread, or scarcely any, produced in that country.

WM. COBBETT.

## AMERICAN PACKET.

### No. IV.

MY DEAR JOHN BULL,

I subjoin two very interesting letters on the subject of *American Manufactures*. The first is from a Mr. Austin of Boston, and the second is the answer of Mr. Jefferson, late President of the United States. The latter also contains Mr. Jefferson's view of the *state of things in Europe*. You will here see, what he thinks of these European proceedings.

LETTER FROM BENJAMIN AUSTIN, ESQ. TO  
THE HON. THOMAS JEFFERSON.

*Boston, December 9. 1815.*

SIR,—Since the return of General —, from his visit to Monticello, I am highly gratified in hearing that you enjoy your health, and that you are so happily situated in your domestic retirement.

During the convulsions in Europe, and the events which have taken place in our country, a person of your accurate observation must have experienced the most anxious solicitude for the result of these important controversies. As to France, we are all disappointed in the termination of a revolution, which promised a relief from the tyranny of establishments, which have been inconsiderately advocated in the federal papers as "legitimate." But the "ways of Heaven are dark and intricate," and we are obliged to submit to the decrees of Providence, however contrary to what we may think are productive to the general happiness of mankind. As France has fallen by an alliance of foreign despots, America must expect to rise by a Union of Freeman, acting in their constitutional capacity. The destiny of France should be a lesson of admonition to the United States.

It must afford you the highest consolation to find, that the honor and the glory of our republic have been promoted by the very means which our enemies had predicted would be ruinous and destructive. Nothing but the interposition of Providence could have produced so much good, from what was considered by some as productive of so much evil. The United States were forced into a controversy in defence of their marine rights, which if they had failed in vindicating, would have checked, if not terminated, their future prospects as an independent nation. At the beginning of the conflict, the prospect was gloomy and perilous. Repeated disasters appalled the timid in the prosecution, while the disaffected were daily attempting to counteract our national efforts, by systematic combinations, and illegitimate conventions — Amidst these complicated difficulties, we have succeeded in our "Appeal to Heaven," and every real American must feel a pride in contemplating, that the energies of an Administration, beset with such a phalanx of opposition, have triumphed, not only over a foreign enemy, but have baffled the wily projects of a more dangerous body of internal foes.—I would not wish to be censorious, but the fact is too evident to be denied. Not that we consider every nominal federalist was thus inimical, but the artful proceedings of certain leaders urged many honest men to adopt those resolutions which have produced numberless serious events. We can easily distinguish between the enticers and the enticed.

As the present state of our country demands some extraordinary efforts in Congress to bring forward the Agricultural and Manufacturing interests of the United States, I am induced to mention a plea, often used by the friends of England, that the work-shops of Europe are recommended by you, as the most proper to furnish articles of Manufacture to the citizens of the United States, by which they infer that it is your opinion, the Manufactures of this country are not proper objects for Congressional pursuits.—They frequently enlarge on this idea as corresponding with your sentiments, and endeavour to weaken our exertions in this particular, by quoting you as the advocate of foreign manufactures, to the exclusion



of domestic. Not that these persons have any friendly motive towards you, but they think it will answer their purposes, if such sentiments can be promulgated with an appearance of respect to your opinion. I am sensible that many of these persons mean to misrepresent your real intentions, being convinced that the latitude they take with your remarks on manufactures, is far beyond what you contemplated at the period they were written. The purity of your mind could not lead you to anticipate the perfidy of foreign nations, which has since taken place.—If you had, it is impossible that you would have discouraged the manufactures of a nation, whose fields have since been abundantly covered with merino sheep, flax and cotton, or depended on looms at 3000 miles distance, to furnish the citizens with clothing, when their internal resources were adequate to produce such necessities by their domestic industry. You will pardon my remarks, and excuse my freedom in writing you on this subject.—But it would be an essential service at this crisis, when the subject of manufactures will come so powerfully before Congress, by petitions from various establishments, if you would condescend to express more minutely, your idea of the “work-shops of Europe,” in the supply of such articles as can be manufactured among ourselves. An explanation from you on this subject would greatly contribute to the advancement of those manufactures, which have risen during the late war to a respectable state of maturity and improvement. Domestic manufacture is the object contemplated; instead of establishments under the sole controul of capitalists, our children may be educated under the inspection of their parents, while the habits of industry may be duly inculcated.

If the general idea should prevail that you prefer foreign work-shops to domestic, the high character you sustain among the friends of our country, may lead them to a discouragement of that enterprize which is viewed by many as an essential object of our national independence. I should not have taken the freedom of suggesting my ideas, but being convinced of your patriotism, and devotedness to the good of your country, have urged me to make the foregoing observations; your candour will excuse me if they are wrong.

I shall be happy in receiving an answer

to this letter, for in the present state of political controversy and intrigue, the real republicans must rely on our “long-trying patriots,” (among whom you stand pre-eminent) to guide and direct in the future pursuits of the government. Though retired from public life, yet your private counsel is essential, and we must solicit your aid to help the administration to substantiate by wise measures in peace, what we have obtained in war. The patriot is always called on duty, while the exigencies of his country need his advice, and his exertions are required to carry his principles into operation.—We are limited but to a few years to discharge our trusts as citizens, and we must become more active as the period shortens. The real patriot never sacrificed principles to policy—Washington, Adams, Hancock, Madison, and yourself rose superior to such a degradation. The old patriots, if not employed in conducting the ship, yet they are viewed as Beacons, by which helmsmen may steer to the haven of safety.

I remain, Sir, with sentiments of the highest respect, and cordial wishes for your happiness, your undeviating friend,

BENJAMIN AUSTIN.

HON. THOMAS JEFFERSON.

MR. JEFFERSON'S ANSWER.

Monticello, Jan. 9. 1816.

DEAR SIR—I acknowledge with pleasure your letter of the 9th Dec. last.

Your opinions on the events which have taken place in France, are entirely just, so far as these events are yet developed. But we have reason to suppose, that they have not reached their ultimate termination. There is still an awful void between the present, and what is to be, the last chapter of that history; and I fear it is to be filled with abominations as frightful, as those which have already disgraced it.—That nation is too high-minded, has too much innate force, intelligence and elasticity, to remain quiet under its present compression. Sampson will arise in his strength, and probably will ere long burst asunder the cords and the webs of the Philistines. But what are to be the scenes of havoc and horror, and how widely they may spread between the brethren of one family, our ignorance of the interior feuds, and antipathies of the country, places beyond our ken. Whatever may

be the convulsions, we cannot but indulge the pleasing hope, they will end in the permanent establishment of a representative government; a government in which the will of the people will be an effective ingredient. This important element has taken root in the European mind, and will have its growth. Their rulers, sensible of this, are already offering this modification of their governments, under the plausible pretence, that it is a voluntary concession on their part. Had Bonaparte used his legitimate power honestly for the establishment and support of a free government, France would now have been in prosperity and rest, and her example operating for the benefit of mankind; every nation in Europe would eventually have founded a government over which the will of the people would have had a powerful control. His improper conduct, however, has checked the salutary progress of principle; but the object is fixed in the eye of nations, and they will press to its accomplishment, and to the general amelioration of the condition of man. What a germ have the Freemen of the United States planted, and how faithfully should they cherish the parent tree at home.—Chagrine and mortification are the punishments our enemies receive.

You tell me I am quoted by those who wish to continue our dependance on England for manufactures. There was a time when I might have been so quoted with more candour. But within the thirty years which have since elapsed, how are circumstances changed! We were then in peace—our independent place among nations was acknowledged. A commerce which offered the raw materials in exchange for the same material, after receiving the last touch of industry, was worthy the attention of all nations. It was expected, that those especially to whom manufacturing industry was important, would cherish the friendship of such customers by every favour, and particularly cultivate their peace by every act of justice and friendship. Under this prospect the question seemed legitimate, whether, with such an immensity of unimproved land, courting the hand of husbandry, the industry of agriculture, or that of manufactures, would add most to the national wealth? And the doubt on the utility of American manufactures was entertained on this consideration

chiefly, that to the labour of the husbandman a vast addition is made by the spontaneous energies of the earth on which it is employed. For one grain of wheat committed to the earth, she renders 20, 30, and even 50 fold—Whereas the labour of the manufacturer falls in most instances vastly below this profit. Pounds of flax in his hands, yield but penny-weights of lace.—This exchange too, laborious as it might seem, what a field did it promise for the occupation of the ocean—what a nursery for that class of citizens who were to exercise and maintain our equal rights on that element! This was the state of things in 1785, when the Notes on Virginia were first published; when the ocean being open to all nations, and their common rights in it acknowledged and exercised under regulations sanctioned by the assent and usage of all, it was thought that the doubt might claim some consideration. But who in 1785, could foresee the rapid depravity which was to render the close of that century a disgrace to the history of civilized society? Who could have imagined that the two most distinguished in the rank of nations, for science and civilization, would have suddenly descended from that honourable eminence, and setting at defiance all those moral laws established by the Author of Nature between nation and nation, as between man and man, would cover earth and sea with robberies and piracies, merely because strong enough to do it with temporal impunity, and that under this disbandment of nations from social order, we should have been despoiled of a thousand ships, and have thousands of our citizens reduced to Algerine slavery?—And all this has taken place. The British interdicted to our vessels all harbours of the globe, without having first proceeded to some one of hers, there they paid a tribute proportioned to the cargo, and obtained her licence to proceed to the port of destination. The French declared them to be lawful prizes if they had touched at the port, or been visited by a ship of the enemy's nation. Thus were we completely excluded from the ocean. Compare this state of things with that of 1785, and say whether an opinion founded in the circumstances of that day, can be fairly applied to those of the present. We have experienced what we did not then believe, that there exists both profligacy and power



enough to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations—That to be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed, or rather assumes a new form. The grand inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He therefore who is now against domestic manufactures, must be for reducing us either to dependence on that nation, or be clothed in skins, and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say, I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort—and if those who quote me as of a different opinion, will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign, where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not soon have a supply at home equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand which has so long wantonly wielded it. If it shall be proposed to go beyond our own supply, the question of 1785 will then recur, viz. Will our surplus labour be then more beneficially employed in the culture of the earth, or in the fabrications of art? We have time yet for consideration, before that question will press upon us; and the maxim to be applied will depend on the circumstances which shall then exist.—For in so complicated a science as political economy, no one axiom can be laid down as wise and expedient for all times and circumstances. Inattention to this is what has called for this explanation to answer the cavils of the uncandid, who use my former opinion only as a stalking-horse to keep us in eternal vassalage to a foreign and unfriendly nation.

I salute you with assurances of great respect and esteem.

TH. JEFFERSON.

BENJAMIN AUSTIN, ESQ.

#### HARTFORD CONVENTION.

The enemies of freedom should be known. Their detested names should be posted up all over the world.—I have, in the American Packet, No. 1, given an

account of the treacherous Cossacks, who met at Hartford. The people in that place keep the *anniversary of the Meeting*, and the following article will shew you *their* manner of doing such things. Would to God that the like were done all over the world!

#### FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE "HARTFORD CONVENTION."

The fifteenth of December, (says the American Mercury) is an epoch in the history of America which can never be passed over by republicans, without mingled emotions of regret and exultation.—Of regret, that we have among us "men—free-born men—men born, nursed, and brought up by our fire-sides—Americans—American citizens," who are so depraved, so wicked, as to aim a dagger at the vitals of their already bleeding country, and to attempt to subvert the liberties of the people. Of exultation, that the grand designs of these hellish conspirators have been frustrated with infamy, and that the Union has triumphed over their mischievous machinations.

Impressed with these sentiments, the Republicans of Hartford, on Friday last, (being the day of the first meeting of the Convention) displayed the flag of the Union at half mast, during the early part of the day, as expressive of their sorrow for the depravity of those, who, one year since, were plotting in our city, in conjunction with Britain, the destruction of the liberties of the Republic. In the afternoon the flag was raised to mast head, as emblematical of the complete discomfiture of their designs, and the triumph of the Constitution. In the rueful countenance of federalists, it was plain to discover the mortification and chagrin they experienced. They say, let us bury in oblivion's dark bastille all bitter recollection. But so long as New-England is cursed with federal rulers; 'till she emerges from the darkness which for years has enveloped her; 'till Republicanism reigns triumphant throughout New England, (which we trust in God is close at hand) it becomes the imperious duty of Republicans, to hold up her rulers to the contempt of the people; to expose their wicked and nefarious designs. It is this alone which is to work the political redemption of New-England. It is this which is to open the eyes of the people.

What! shall a faction who, in the time of darkness and danger, sided with the enemies of their country; who, when the ——— of Britain were pouring upon our shores, and threatened a war of extermination; when his incendiary torch had laid in ashes our capital, and the fate of our flourishing country hung in awful suspense; when all around was dark and gloomy, and the smile upon the face passed off like the sunbeam upon the ocean, which the next indulation of the wave effaces, raised their rebellious standard, and carried, with the whole strength of party, the touch of "disunion and civil war;" who threatened to dissolve the national compact; to annul the Constitution of the States; to abolish the laws of Congress, and strove to throw the funds and every fiscal resource into confusion; shall these men be so fostered among us, and their accursed designs shrouded in darkness? No: We must never forget them—we must never cease to expose their baseness. Had the measures they were pursuing succeeded, we should have seen town arrayed in arms against town; neighbour against neighbour; father against son, and son against father. We should have seen our proud edifice of liberty tottering to its base, and heaven and earth, with one united voice, weeping our premeditated fate.—Cold, indeed, and unfeeling must be that mind, and insensible that heart, which can, without emotion, reflect on conduct so eminently depraved—so shockingly atrocious—But, thank God, their designs upon the Republic have been frustrated, and our country restored to prosperity and happiness. James Madison, whom they sought to depose, still sways its destinies. He, like the bright luminary of day, which the clouds of calumny can but transiently obscure, pursues his exalted course unshaken and serene. Under the steady wisdom of this illustrious individual, the government has acquired that stability, consistency and splendour, which will long adorn—for ever adorn the envied name of America.—Let us then be vigilant and watchful for the preservation of these blessings. Let us bear in mind that we have men among us who have aimed a blow at our liberties. Although they have been foiled in their first attempt, still they will be active. Their plans are as multiform as human ingenuity can devise. Their great

object, the ultimate end of all their exertions, is to tear down from its base the Grecian edifice of Republicanism, and to erect in its room the Gothic castle of Royalty. Let us then, admonish you to beware of such men; for they are "horrible as the touch of the Basilisk"—shun them!—fly them!! In their looks is deceit, in their hearts is murder!

We think it a duty we owe our country, to publish, annually, the names of those who composed the "Hartford Convention"—that they may never be forgotten.

The following are the names—viz.

GEORGE CABOT,  
NATHAN DANE,  
WILLIAM PRESCOTT,  
HARRISON G. OTIS,  
TIMOTHY BIGELOW,  
JOSHUA THOMAS,  
SAMUEL S. WILDE,  
JOSEPH LYMAN,  
STE'N LONGFELLOW, jr.  
DANIEL WALDO,  
HODIJAH BALIES,  
GEORGE BLISS,  
CHAUN. GOODRICH, (deceased)  
JAMES HILLHOUSE,  
JOHN TREADWELL,  
ZEPHANIAH SWIFT,  
NATHANIEL SMITH,  
CALVIN GODDARD,  
ROGER M. SHERMAN,  
DANIEL LYMAN,  
SAMUEL WARD,  
EDWARD MANTON,  
BENJAMIN HAZARD,  
BENJAMIN WEST,  
MILLS OLCOTT,  
WILLIAM HALL, jr.

#### DEBATE ON THE FINANCES OF THE COUNTRY.

(Mr. J. P. Grant's Speech continued from p. 766.)

The total amount of the loans for this year was 14,307,692*l.*; so that there was no very material difference in the two statements. This was the view of matters for this year, and the Right Honourable Gentleman appeared to think that he could get through it very satisfactorily; but the House ought to consider where we should stand when this year was over, and the present resources should cease to



operate. In another resolution he had stated the following charges for services performed in former years, which could not recur in any future year:

Ordnance service, 1814.....	£67,205	9	10
Ditto.....1815.....	16,851	13	4
Ditto in Ireland..1815.....	19,384	12	3
Payment of debentures, under the act of the 43d of the King....	807,085	0	0
Debt to the East India Company	945,491	14	4
Ditto to the Bank of England..	1,500,000	0	0
Balance due by Ireland.....	1,605,585	2	6

Making in all.....£4,961,603 11 3

which could not be properly said to belong to the expenditure of the present year. After the army estimates had been laid before the House, subsequent estimates were presented which showed that the reductions proposed to be made from the charge of the staff of the army in 1816 would amount to the sum of 40,287*l.* 12*s.* but that in future years the same would amount to 81,597*l.* 6*s.* 5*d.* making in future years a further saving in the expense of the army of 41,309*l.* 14*s.* 5*d.* By the estimate of reductions proposed to be made from the charge of the ordnance department, it appeared that these reductions in 1816 amounted to 175,959*l.* 10*s.* making in future years a farther saving in the expense of the ordnance of 42,652*l.* 5*s.* Now, if these several sums of 4,961,603*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.* 41,309*l.* 14*s.* 5*d.* and 42,652*l.* 5*s.* making together 5,045,375*l.* 10*s.* 8*d.* be taken from the sum of 32,722,630*l.* 12*s.* 11*d.* the remainder might be properly considered as the expenditure of the year 1816, and as the annual expenditure, if the establishments were not reduced, likely to be in future incurred (with the exception of savings from the falling in of pensions, half-pay, and other incidental expenses) amounting to the sum of 27,677,055*l.* 9*s.* 3*d.*

Mr. W. M. SMITH rose to speak to order. He considered this one of the most interesting subjects that could come before the House, but it demanded a peculiar degree of attention, and unless that attention were given to it by the Gentlemen on the opposite side, very little good could be expected to result.

Mr. J. P. GRANT was only sorry that he had undertaken a duty which required talents such as he saw at no great distance from him (Mr. Tierney) to render this subject perfectly clear and interesting.

He was anxious that the country should know the amount of the annual expenditure, which was about 27,677,000*l.* If from this expenditure were deducted the actual revenue of the present year, taking away the extraordinary resources, let the House see where the revenue stood. Of the ways and means of the present year, the sum of 5,663,755*l.* arose from grants of the year 1815; to which being added various other items, which could not be properly considered as the revenue of the present year, there would remain 9,800,000*l.* as the ways and means of the present and future years. The result, therefore, of these calculations was, that we had only 9,800,000*l.* of disposable revenue to meet an expenditure of 27,677,000*l.* taking Great Britain and Ireland together. The last resolution stated the difference, which, according to the present establishment, made the deficiency amount to 17,877,000*l.* with the exception of some trifling errors he might have unavoidably fallen into. It did appear to him to be the imperative duty of every member who had formed these views of the subject to state his sentiments to the House. It was not for him to propose a remedy, though he might have formed one opinion on that branch of the subject; the information requisite for such a proposal rested with ministers alone; they must have contemplated the present situation of affairs for many years; and all the successful circumstances of the war had thrown large sums into their hands, to aid them in such an endeavour. But when the war was entered into last year, he (Mr. G.) stated the dangerous situation of the finances, and the Right Hon. Gentleman opposite could not have gone to bed a single night without its coming home to his thoughts. He (Mr. G.) did not expect much from the Noble Lord (Castlereagh)—he was too much occupied in the government of France to attend to that of England; but from the Chancellor of the Exchequer he did expect something like an explanation. The Right Hon. Gentleman had made it a matter of boast that 3,000,000*l.* had been paid off; but that was out of the sinking fund, and he had forgotten the 5,000,000*l.* surplus of last year; so that, instead of having paid off the debt, the Right Hon. Gentlemen knew, when he proposed the present establishment, that

that establishment exceeded by many millions the highest revenue of a period of war, when the income-tax was in full force. The expenditure of the present year amounted to 29,499,000*l.*; the charge on the consolidated fund to 43,300,000*l.*; and the revenue amounted to 66,000,000*l.* and some odd thousand pounds; so that the expenditure for this year exceeded the revenue of a year of war by seven millions. His Majesty's ministers never thought of making any reductions till the income tax was refused: and what were the savings that they had effected?—rather curious than important: they amounted to a small sum on the staff of the army, and to a small sum in the ordnance department: out of such an expenditure as he had stated, they amounted to 177,000*l.*: this was the reduction on our army, navy, and ordnance expenditure of 23,000,000*l.* If compared with the whole expenditure, it was trifling indeed; but if compared with the amount of the particular branches from which it had been deducted, it was rather more considerable. But the House might be aware that his Majesty's ministers could not save unless compelled to do so, and that they could save if they were compelled. He (Mr. G.) thought savings might be made, but he was at a loss to conceive how, under the estimate that had been given in. If only a million could be reduced out of the estimated expenditure, it would be nothing towards what was required. It had been held out that no reduction could be made in the colonies, and according to the ministerial statements, so far from any hopes in Ireland, we ought, on their calculation, to set down 28,000 men as necessary; then the number of men in this kingdom could not be lessened when there were so many in the neighbouring states. From all this he did not conclude that great savings could not be made, but that they could not be made with such views as ministers entertained. He wished to know what statement they would make, and what pledge they would give for the

large savings they had promised. He had now done with the expenditure, and should come to the consideration of the revenue; he would ask if there was any rational expectation of an increase of revenue such as to meet the exigencies of the case? The revenue indeed was sinking and falling. If gentlemen looked to the papers before the House, they would find a surplus stated of 485,665*l.* (no great increase on a revenue of 66,000,000*l.*) But comparing the excise and customs of the three last quarters with the returns of the three quarters preceding, there certainly was a considerable diminution, and the 485,665*l.* increase upon the whole revenue, was accounted for by the rise in the item of stamps. The prospect was most cheerless, and he saw no hopes of any increase. What was the plan the Right Hon. Gentleman had proposed? To borrow of the Bank?—even that resource must soon be exhausted, and under what circumstances did he borrow? He would have us believe in the probability of a resumption of cash payments; but if they were not resumed now, it would be found necessary to continue the restrictions for ever, and then the Right Hon. Gentleman could only look on to a further issue, and a further depreciation of the currency, to relieve us from our present burdens: if he had any plan it must be this: but he (Mr. G.) was convinced the Right Hon. Gentlemen had no plan at all; he was only going on from day to day, as occurrences turned up, and trusting to his stars for extrication. If he (Mr. G.) could only obtain a pledge that the Right Hon. Gentleman had any plan by which he could extricate us from our present difficulties, he should feel at least better satisfied than he did at present.

On the resolution being put “that there has been voted for the service of the navy during the present year 10,114,345*l.* 11*s.* 7*d.*”—

*(To be continued.)*